

P240
Am 32
No. 14

No. 14.

COLONIZATION.

THE PRESENT SCHEME OF COLONIZATION, WRONG,
DELUSIVE, AND RETARDS EMANCIPATION.

By JOHN G. FEE.

PASTOR OF THE CHURCH AT BEREA, MADISON CO., KY.

The arguments contained in this tract were first prepared for the Kentucky News, and published in that paper, in 1853.

They were afterward revised for the Christian Press, in which paper they appeared in successive numbers.

The great majority of readers want, not a voluminous work, but only a tract; a short, consecutive argument, with a few facts.

Much of this tract is an appeal to conscience and Christian principle; because, says a British writer, "we never made any headway in the abolition of the slave-trade, and of slavery, till it was taken up by religious men, prosecuted as a concern of the soul, with reference to eternity, and motives drawn from the cross of Christ."

Some of the friends of freedom say, "strike at the evils of slavery, and let plans alone." This would be wise, were it not for the fact, that slaveholders have already given to the people a plan; a plan which, as we shall see, forestalls our action, and serves to perpetuate slavery. A portion of the people have embraced this plan. We must convince them of its errors before we can expect them to embrace another. So we act in the temperance reform.

COLONIZATION.

Of colonization there are two kinds. One is voluntary, free, unoppressive ; in which persons, with all the immunities and privileges of citizens, choose to leave their own country, to go to another for the purpose of getting and doing good. To this we have no objection, and will help such as far as we can, consistently with other duties.

There is another form of colonization, which is coercive and oppressive ; in which the slaves of our country are required to be *banished, as a condition of their freedom*; and in which it is proposed that those colored persons now free, be so oppressed by laws and restrictions of social and political privileges, that they shall be constrained to leave.* These are the positions, as we believe, of most persons who advocate popular colonization. To such oppression, we regret to say, the American Colonization Society has lent its sanction, as the sequel will show. To such we are opposed ; because,

I. It is unjust. Banishment has ever been regarded as a punishment for crime—a criminal's portion. To inflict such a penalty upon an innocent man is, manifestly, flagrant injustice. In the sight of God it is as much so, as the banishment or oppression of a white man. God's law requires us to deal *justly*, and love mercy. There is neither justice nor mercy in banishing the innocent from the land of his birth, and the association of his friends.

* See Af. Rep. vol. V. pp. 20, 21, 241. Also, Thirty-Second Annual Report Af. Rep., May, 1853. Many of our references are taken from the recent work of G. B. Stebbins

In the language of another: "To make a removal from one's *native country* a *sine qua non* of setting him *free*, when held in involuntary *bondage*, is the climax of moral absurdity. Because, it is an offer to restore an inalienable *right*, on condition of being permitted to restrain the *exercise* of that right in one of its most fundamental and essential particulars. It offers *freedom*, on condition that freedom of choice shall *not exist*; that the person made *free* shall not remain where he *chooses*, and reside where he *pleases*. It offers to discharge a *duty*, by the perpetration of an act of *injustice*; to make *restitution* by a new *aggression*; to do *right*, with a reservation of the privilege of doing *wrong*."

Again, in the language of a distinguished United States senator: "Compulsory expatriation of any class is an offense against civilization, and incompatible with *justice*. Let all classes of our population, of whatever complexion, and of whatever origin, be dealt with upon the simple principles of right, justice, and humanity."—*Reply of S. P. Chase to Mr. Miller, March 3, 1853.*

Again, in the language of a southern divine: "Society is bound, and that *now and always*, to see that *every* man is *fairly* dealt by and *justly* paid by every other man in it; and every human being is bound to do justice to *everybody*."—*R. J. Breckenridge, of Danville, Ky. Af. Rep.* ix. 329.

As just men, we may not consent to coercive colonization.

II. Such colonization sunders the marriage and parental relations; relations of God's appointment; relations which should be sacred in the esteem of every man who is a husband or a parent; relations which are the very safeguards of virtue and tranquillity. Yet this valuable and sacred relation is often sundered by the popular

colonization of this age. To illustrate: suppose the case of a faithful and upright slave, whose wife and children are owned by a determined pro-slavery man. His master, however, has become convinced that slavery is wrong, a violation of every element of justice, of the law of love, and is, therefore, sinful. Also, he feels that he ought not to give his *example* in favor of a wrong relation, however kind he may be disposed to treat his slave. Also, he feels that he ought to secure freedom to his slave, so that the slave's happiness shall not be jeopardized after he (the master) dies. He accordingly announces to his faithful slave, that, from a sense of duty and kind regard, he intends to give him his freedom, and wishes him *now* and forever to regard himself as a free man. The poor slave, in humble attitude, with hat in hand, and cheek bathed in tears of gratitude, thanks his master for the precious boon of freedom. With light heart and cheerful mien he hastens to bear the intelligence to his faithful wife. The glad tidings are welcomed by her with manifest joy. But a second thought brings sorrow and distress to the heart. She reveals it by saying, "George, do you know that the laws of this country, and most of the professed Christians of this land, will not allow you to enjoy your freedom *here*? If you enjoy this blessing, you must go into a distant land, many thousand miles hence, and leave, perhaps forever, leave me and my little babes."

Imagine, oh, imagine the anguish of the poor unoffending man, as he contemplates his sad fate! He must either submit to the gloom of imprisonment and perpetual slavery, or he must say "farewell, a long and an eternal farewell" to objects dear to him as life. Oh, how cruel! Yet this the Colonization Society demands; affirming, as it does, that "All emancipation, to however small an

extent, which permits the persons emancipated to remain in the country, is an evil.”—(*First Annual Report.*)

And this Society has greatly aided in the formation of those laws which now enforce the sentiment that disregards the marriage and parental relations. The principle is inhuman and impious. Heaven has no smiles for the man or association that thus tramples down its institution.

III. Such colonization violates Christ's golden rule: “Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.”

Even if we allow the poor man his wife and children, still we can not compel him to leave the land of his birth, to which he is now acclimated, and where he can enjoy life and health, and go to a distant land, imbibe the diseases of a strange climate, and endure the privations of a colonist; we can not compel him to do this, and do as we would be done by.

It may be said, it will be better for the man. We reply, of this every adult, sane man, should be his own judge; for,

(1.) When we assume to judge for another, we violate the above rule; we would not, in such matters, be willing for others, especially our enemies, to judge for us.

(2.) We should adopt a policy which would strike down all liberty, civil and religious.

The Roman tyrant assumed the position we are opposing, when he banished the early Christians from Rome. The Jews had a prejudice against the Christians, and by their persecutions caused much disturbance: Claudius, like some of the present day, disregarding the claims of natural justice, banished every Christian from the place. In like manner, whenever the enemies, or professed friends of the writer, or reader, may have the power, and adjudge it best, they may banish either or both of

us. Grant the principle, and there is no limitation. Then, severe as the remark may seem, the position is the *tyrant's plea, and the enemy of all liberty.*

It may be said, these slaves choose to go. We reply : very many choose to go, just as the traveler chooses to give up his money, when the robber meets him, presents a pistol to his breast, and tells the traveler he may have his life, if he will give up his money. The traveler gives up his money, rather than his life. So the slave gives up the land of his birth, rather than be a perpetual slave ; but he leaves it by *constraint.*

It may be said they are "negroes." If they are, still they are *men.* There are horses, white and black ; but the black is none the less a horse because he is black ; so the "colored man" is none the less a *man* because he is "colored." The rule then is, "whatsoever ye would that *men* should do unto you, do ye even so to them." Now, can any man by his vote, or consent, force another to leave the land of his birth, the place of his choice, peril the dangers of the ocean, and endure the privations of a colonist, as a condition of his freedom, and do as he would be done by ? Can we claim to be *Christians*, and deliberately violate one of God's plainest commands ? We oppose such colonization, then, because it is a plain violation of the Christian rule ; because we profess to be Christians, and should be Christians in *all things.* "He that faileth in one point is guilty of the whole law." We may sin in such banishment as really as in slavery itself. Indeed, the principle of it is the same as that of slavery itself. It is oppression still ; a violation of the law of love. No man can maintain a Christian character and persist in it. Yet the laws of several of the States of this Union, approved by the professed followers of Christ, require, as a condition of freedom, that the colored

man shall be banished. And of seven thousand six hundred and eighty-two colored persons sent by the Colonization Society from this country to Liberia, only three thousand three hundred and sixty-five went of their own free choice; the others were banished to a distant land as a condition of their freedom. See Appendix A.

IV. In banishing the colored man, you would often banish Christ in the person of his poor.

Many of these colonists are true, devoted Christians. The scriptures represent Christ as dwelling in, and communing with, such — “temples of the Holy Ghost.” Hence, in his description of the scenes of the judgment day, (Mat. xxv. 40,) he says, “inasmuch as ye have done it” (an act of unkindness) “unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.” What we do to them, we do to him. Christian! Sinner! Will you vote for, or consent to a law or custom, that banishes Christ in the person of his poor? Were Christ here in person, would you vote for a law, or sustain a society, that would banish Christ from the land? Many have done it.

But, says one, did not this present scheme of colonization originate with good men, such as Finley and Mills, in the formation of the American Colonization Society? We answer, such is the popular belief, and general representation; and much favor is secured to the scheme by representing it as originating with such men. But this is an error.

In 1777, Mr. Jefferson suggested the idea of colonizing the free colored persons, but there was then no definite action. The first definite action in favor of this scheme was in the Virginia legislature, sixteen years before the formation of the Colonization Society. This action was not with a view to benefit Africa, nor the colored man here, but the *slaveholder*, as we shall see. It was

immediately after a rumor of an insurrection in Virginia. It was in the following resolves :

“*Resolved*, That the Governor be requested to correspond with the President of the United States, for the purpose of obtaining a place, without the limits of the same, to which *free* negroes and mulattoes, and such as may be emancipated, may be sent.” * * *

Mr. Mercer states, that the resolution was introduced prior, but with a view to the formation of the American Colonization Society.—(Af. Rep. XII. 114.)

Hear what the Society itself says. After referring to the act of the Virginia Legislature, Dec., 1815, and quoting the preamble and resolutions, it adds: “Encouraged by this movement on the part of a State so distinguished as Virginia, and so deeply interested in the subject of the resolution, a number of gentlemen, friendly to the plan of African colonization, assembled in the city of Washington,” &c.—(Af. Repos. XII. 51.)

“In the year 1816, the Legislature of Virginia, solemnly impressed with the momentous interest of the scheme, and deprecating the increasing dangers of delay, appealed, with an almost unanimous voice, to the general government, for its aid in procuring an asylum for the reception of its free colored population. Influenced by *these examples*, some fifteen or twenty of the wisest men of the nation formed themselves into a society, called, ‘The American Society for Colonizing,’ ” &c. — (Cyrus Edwards, Af. Repos. VII. 9.)

In 1836, Rev. Mr. Plummer, of Virginia, said, “The plan of colonizing the free blacks, and such as might be made free, originated here. The principles of the Society are Virginia principles.”—(Af. Rep. XII. 67.)

The Virginia Legislature suggested the thing. Charles F. Mercer claimed the merit of devising the plan of

operation, and of having communicated it to others on a journey to the North, during the summer preceeding the organization of the Society.—(Af. Rep. IX. 265.)

'Tis certain, then, that the Colonization Society had not that holy origin generally ascribed to it. And it is also apparent, that it originated, not so much for the good of the colored man here, or in Africa, but for the benefit of the slaveholder.* This will be still more apparent under the next position we shall assume.

V. The present popular scheme of colonization protects, defends, and perpetuates slavery. This it does,

1st. By leaving the title of the master unquestioned, and rendering the slave property more secure and more valuable.

This was the avowed design in the very organization of the American Colonization Society. The president of the preliminary meeting, previous to the adoption of the constitution, on taking the chair, remarked, "This meeting was not proposed to consider any question of emancipation. It was only on that condition that many gentlemen were present from the South and West, and could be expected to coöperate."

In the same meeting, John Randolph, of Virginia, declared, "This meeting does not in any wise affect the question of negro slavery; but, as far as it goes, *must materially tend to secure the property of every master in the United States over his slaves!!*"

On another occasion, Mr. Randolph, alluding to his own remarks, said: "I thought it necessary to make

* We doubt not but that at its *organization*, some who were then engaged, were prompted by good motives, but led by erring judgments. So with some now coöperating.

The coöperation of men of reputed goodness is desired in almost every enterprise, to give it character.

these remarks, being myself a slaveholder, to show that, so far from being connected with the abolition of slavery, *the measure proposed would prove one of the greatest securities to enable the master to keep in possession his own property.*"—(*See Second Annual Report.*)

The same sentiment has been continued since the organization, as seen in the following quotations :

"The rights of masters are to remain *sacred* in the eyes of this Society. The tendency of the scheme, and one of its objects is, to *secure slaveholders* and the whole southern country against certain evil consequences growing out of the threefold mixtures of our population."—(*African Repository*, IV. 274.) Mr. Archer, in an address, said, "The object of the society involved no intrusion upon *property*, or even upon *prejudice*."—(*Fifteenth Annual Report.*)

In the same report we are told how colonization renders slave labor more secure: "What is the free black to the slave? A standing, perpetual incitement to discontent." "Because, in the spectacle of voluntary labor is seen the folly of involuntary labor."—(*Fifteenth Annual Report.*)

Again, "To remove these" (free blacks) "from among us, will *increase the usefulness*, and improve the moral character of those who remain in servitude."

Mr. Miller, in the Senate of the United States, March 3, 1854, speaking of the American Colonization Society, said, "This experiment has given to the American institution of slavery a *moral power and sanction* which neither the law nor constitution could invest it with." "The Republic of Liberia is a witness of good, and not of evil, to slavery in the United States." Yes, at this present hour, popular colonization is the patron of slavery.

2d. The Colonization Society protects slavery, by apol-

ogizing for it as expedient.—(See Af. Rep. IV. 1–19 ; V. 3–27 ; VII. 200–202.)

3d. The Society protects slavery, by apologizing for it as a happy relation, and a position best suited to the present condition of the slaves.

In the organ of the Society, African Repository, for Dec., 1853, in an article approved by a preface from the secretary of the Society, we have the following: “The slaves of the South are well clothed and fed, and taken care of in sickness and health, in youth and old age, and, with very rare exceptions, they are well treated.”

If the writer of this article is a husband and a father, would he regard his wife and children as well treated if they were held as *chattels* by some southern planter, in that intellectual and moral degradation, and *liable* to those insults, scourgings, separations, and bereavements which most slaves are liable to ?

Again, says the same writer, “As a class, they are probably more cheerful and happy than any other, and that they *increase rapidly* furnishes strong evidence that they are in a condition best suited to their present condition.” The secretary and editor of the Repository assures us that the writer of these extracts is a “Massachusetts man.” It is a shame that a man living in a state famed as the very cradle of civil and religious liberty, renowned for intelligence and enterprise, covered with school houses and churches, should put so low an estimate upon liberty, intellectual and moral improvement, as to suppose that fast breeding is the chief end of existence, and to feed and fatten for the market the “best position” for three millions of human beings, made in the image and for the glory of God. If so, slaveholders should be enslaved. To state the position, is to show its grossness and sensuality.

It is also a most humiliating thought, that a minister of the gospel, as we understand the Rev. secretary of the Colonization Society to be, should so far lose sight of his high calling, as to connive at the degradation of millions of human intelligences, instead of rebuking the oppressor, and teaching them to live, and help all others to live, for the *highest glory of God*.

From a whole life in the midst of slaves, I know they are not contented and happy. They are not yet so far imbruted by slavery as to have wholly lost the desire and thirst for liberty natural to man. This is shown, by the continual escape to Canada, braving, as they do, the great danger of recapture, imprisonment, the lash, and the cotton field.

The tendency of all such articles, as the one alluded to, is to allay the rising sympathies and activities of anti-slavery men, and thus leave slavery the more secure.

4th. The Colonization Society perpetuates slavery, by making efforts to defend slavery from the *Bible*. The following are extracts of addresses delivered to the Society, or found in the publications of the Society, without being rebuked or corrected by the Society, so far as we have seen; and we have read the Society's journal for several years.

We notice the following :

"We believe there is not the slightest moral turpitude in holding slaves, under existing circumstances, at the South."—(Af. Rep. IX. 4.)

"I understand the epistle to Timothy to forbid the preaching of manumission."—(*S. M. Hopkins, Pres. N. Y. Col. Society.*)

"We proceed to prove that the Bible does recognize property in man. We refer to the Old and New Testa-

holds throughout." "That the rights of the master or owner of slave property are acknowledged by the divine law, that the precepts of the Old and New Testaments are addressed to both masters and slaves, and, that this relation, so far from being disturbed, was fully recognized."—(Af. Rep. XII. 375.)

"Christianity forbade idolatry, but not slavery."—(*S. H. Cox, D. D., Address to N. Y. Col. Soc., 1851.*) The doctor had better examine again 1 Tim. i. 10, and 1 Cor. v. 11.

Still more recent is an extract from an article found in the African Repository, for Dec., 1853. The article is introduced and recommended by the *secretary* of the Society, by styling it an "interesting essay," and by copying, approvingly, the words of the editor of the Boston Courier, who affirms that "the remarks of the writer commend themselves to the earnest notice of every one who wishes to find honest opinions on a subject which so few can handle with unclouded judgment and calmness of temper."

They are as follows: "Slavery is said to be a sin, but yet we find no direct prohibition of it in the Bible; but, on the contrary, the relation of master and slave is more than once recognized there; while it is certain, that for some purpose God has permitted its existence since the creation of the world." In the same sense he has permitted drunkenness and murder, but has *approved* neither. The above extracts are manifest efforts to defend slavery from the Bible. The editor of the Repository says, "It is the policy of the Society not to introduce articles that will tend to agitate the question of slavery." We notice it now introduces articles that will agitate *for*, but not *against*, slavery. We see no Bible arguments against slavery, but plenty in favor of it.

5th. The Society perpetuates slavery, by removing the free laborer, and thereby increasing the demand for and value of slave labor.

If the writer were able to remove all or most of the horses of the South to another country, he would increase thereby the demand for, and value of mules and oxen. So, when we remove the free laborer, we increase the demand for slaves, and value of slave property.

But, says one, will not, in accordance with the laws of trade, the supply from abroad be as the demand and value of laborers? We answer, it would be, but for the *odium* of slavery. Thousands of free laborers would come into the South, and thousands more from the poorer districts of the South would go into the richer portions, and labor for wages, were it not for the existence of slavery, which renders labor disreputable; branded, as they would be, by some aristocrats, as "white negroes." If there is any one thing which the non-slaveholders of the South ought to demand of their representatives at the ballot box, and demand vigorously and perseveringly, it is *protection for labor*,—protection from that odium which slavery throws upon labor.

It is slavery, then, that keeps away the supply of free labor. Every free colored man, therefore, that is removed, increases the demand for, and value of slave labor. As slavery becomes more valuable, emancipation will be retarded.

6th. The Colonization Society perpetuates slavery by directing the sympathies, means, and activities of anti-slavery men in a wrong channel; to a delusive and futile work, so far as emancipation is concerned.

There are many men who feel that slavery is a great moral wrong to the slave, and a great curse to free laborers, white and black; they feel that they ought to do some-

thing for the oppressed colored man, and for the relief of their country ; and being taught by some that the colonization scheme affords a channel for such benevolent effort,* they direct their means and their energies through it ; but into one worse than abortive. Hence, pro-slavery men tolerate the Colonization Society, and say, "it does very well as a kind of safety-valve through which to let off the morbid anti-slavery sentiment of some anti-slavery men." A kind of safety-valve through which to let off human sympathy and sense of natural justice, which otherwise might burst out against the oppressor with righteous indignation, and blow up the cruel system that oppresses the innocent poor. Anti-slavery man ! you have noble impulses planted by heaven, and designed for noble purposes—the elevation of your species. What a misfortune that they should be lost upon the air, sponged up in a worse than futile course. Look at facts. The Colonization Society has been in existence more than thirty-seven years. It has had the sanction of church and state, the patronage of state and of the national government, the eloquence of the pulpit and the bar, the indefatigable labors of talented and good, but misdirected men. What has it accomplished ? It has removed, upon an average, two hundred and seven men annually, and, in the whole time, seven thousand six hundred and eighty-two ; not the tenth part of the increase of the colored population for *one year*, much less the principal of more than three millions. When will it accomplish the work ?

The Christian Spectator estimates that the slave population of our country doubles itself in less than twenty

* See Af. Rep., Vol. III. p. 5. Also, Anti-Slavery Reporter, Vol. I. No. 2.

years. If this be so, we shall have in the South, within the lifetime of a man, thirty millions of slaves. Will the Colonization Society accomplish the work of removing this multitude ?

The impracticability of this scheme caused Thomas Clarkson, the distinguished philanthropist, to renounce it. The present president of the Society, as we shall hereafter show, acknowledges that the Society is incompetent to the work, and is not likely ever to do it.

Does any one say, we hope the Society will grow in numbers and means, as population increases, so as to be adequate to the task ? We answer :

1st. This is improbable. For distinguished philanthropists abroad, as Wilberforce and Clarkson, and our Jays and Smiths at home, have abandoned it as worse than delusive.

2d. On looking over the last number of the African Repository, we find the receipts for the Society are, from free States, as six to one from the slave States. In the free States abolitionists are increasing an hundred fold faster than colonizationists are. And abolitionists are opposed to popular, coercive colonization.

3d. Colonization is a selfish scheme, and its friends have not that self-sacrifice, zeal, and devotion necessary to success in any great enterprise. Let us who are stewards for God see to it, that our labor be not lost, worse than lost ; for this scheme prevents the adoption of some other, and one more efficient. Thomas Clarkson, speaking of this Society, says, “ I may say further, if the Society still exists, it is criminal ; for to hold out that this scheme would produce the entire extinction of slavery in America, (and this was held out with an inconceivable obstinacy,) what was it, or what is it, but to delude the public as well as themselves, and to teach people to rely upon this

measure ? Whereas, if their scheme had never been proposed, they would have been looking out for some other remedy or cure."

7th. Again, this Society perpetuates slavery by making the impression that the colored people are so "diseased in intellect," debased in character, and that such a prejudice exists against them, that they can never rise to a respectable position in society, never be any thing but nuisances and a dangerous element of society, and thus fosters *caste*. In the leading organ of that Society, the colored people are represented as "An anomalous race of beings, the most debased on earth."—(Af. Rep. VII. 230.) Again, the free colored population are represented as "notoriously ignorant, degraded, and miserable, mentally diseased, broken-spirited, acted upon by no motives to honorable exertion, scarcely reached in their debasement by the heavenly light."—(Af. Rep. I. 168.) To this the speaker says "there are exceptions." We deny the truth of the position as a general remark. We shall adduce facts in the sequel.

Again ; "Here they (the colored people) must be forever debased ; more than this, they must be forever useless ; more than this, they must be forever a nuisance, from which it would be a blessing for society to be rid." Again ; "The African, in this country, belongs by birth to the very lowest station in society ; and from that station *he can never rise*, BE HIS TALENTS, HIS ENTERPRISE, HIS VIRTUES, WHAT THEY MAY. * * They constitute a class by themselves—a class out of which *no individual can be elevated*, and below which none can be depressed."—(See African Repository, vol. IV. p. 119.)

The assertion is false, as the case of F. Douglass, Dr. Pennington, James McCune Smith, Ward, Reymond, and many others prove. And thus does the Society persecute

and degrade the colored man, under the name of "humanity and Christianity."

Hon. Edward Everett, then Secretary of State, delivering an address before the Colonization Society, said, "It would, I think, be unjust to urge, as a proof of the intellectual inferiority of the civilized men of color in this country, that they have not made much intellectual progress. It appears to me that they have done quite as much as could be expected under the depressing circumstances in which they have been placed. What branch of the European family, if held in the same condition for three centuries, would not be subject to the same reproach? * * * * Why, sir, it is but a short time since we Anglo-Americans were habitually spoken of by our brethren in England as a degenerate and inferior race. * * * * The learned blacksmith of Alabama, now in Liberia, has attained a celebrity scarcely inferior to that of his white brother, known by the same designation. I frequently attended the examinations at a school in Cambridge, at which Beverly Williams was a pupil. Two youths from Georgia, and a son of my own, were his fellow-pupils. Beverly was a born slave in Mississippi, and apparently of pure African blood. He was one of the best scholars, perhaps the best Latin scholar, in his class. These are indications of intellectual ability, afforded under discouraging circumstances at home. * * * *

"In the face of facts like these, it becomes us to be somewhat cautious in setting down the colored race in America as one of hopeless inferiority."

We further reply—

1. 'Tis strange that the Colonization Society should propose to civilize Africa with a people "diseased in intellect," "debased in character, so as to be acted upon by

no motives to honorable exertion, and scarcely reached by the heavenly light," "a nuisance from which it were a blessing for society to be rid." What fine missionaries, the Society being judge.

2. When the friends of colonization wish to favorably impress the lovers of intellectual and moral good, with the importance of their work in Liberia, they give us interesting pictures of the pecuniary, intellectual, and moral improvement of the colonists. We doubt not this improvement, and believe that the same persons are capable of the same mental and moral improvement here; and would colonizationists be such friends to them here, as were the friends of Dr. Pennington, S. R. Ward, and F. Douglass, they might have equal intellectual and moral standing. These men can now move in the first circles in all European countries, and in portions of our own. Why can they not here? You say, because there is a prejudice against them.

This is the assumed position of many colonization articles, and forms the chief staple of almost every colonization speech. We find assertions like the following: "*Invincible* prejudice excludes them from the enjoyment of the society of whites, and denies to them all the advantages of free men."—(Af. Rep. Vol. VI. 17.)

The word prejudice is here used, not in the sense of prejudging, but in the sense of odium, hatred, proscription, *caste*. Is this *caste right*? It exists in India among people of the same color. It exists in Europe among people of the same color. It exists in our own country toward those of a different color or complexion; and toward those of the same complexion (white), as we shall show.

Did Christ, the Saviour of the world, sanction it in his acts toward the daughter of Samaria, and the Canaan-

itish woman? Did he, when he mingled and dined with publicans and sinners—Gentiles—as much despised by Jews then, as colored persons now are by some white persons?

Does the Holy Spirit sanction caste, when it dwells alike with every holy heart, irrespective of color?

Does God, the Father, sanction it, when he declares he loves the whole world, and is no *respector* of persons? And shall worms, depraved, arrogate to themselves more purity and dignity than the holy God?

Did the practice of the inspired apostle, when he “withstood Peter face to face,” because he refused to eat with his Gentile brethren, “after that certain came down from James”—i. e. from Jerusalem—did his rebuke sanction caste?

Does Christianity, whose cardinal precept, regulating the duty of man to his fellow man, requires of them, “whatsoever ye would that *men* should do to you, *do ye even so to them*,”—does this sanction caste? Did it at its first promulgation, when it overleaped all the barriers of caste, and blended into one spirit the antipodes of all nations, declaring, God hath made of one blood all nations of men, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; did it then sanction caste? Every honest man must say No! Its language still is, “My brethren have not the faith of our Lord Jesus with respect to persons.” “If ye have respect of persons, ye commit sin.” But popular colonization teaches that we should have respect to persons, and give to the white man privileges here we should not to the colored man. Colonization makes *war* upon God, and the very system of truth by which our souls are to be sanctified. Who will sustain it, and fight against his Maker and the highest interests of his own soul?

Again; this caste, which is fed by colonization, makes

war upon *man*, all men—the same color, and all colors. It despises the laboring man of the same color in India; it despises the laboring man of the same color (white) in Europe; it despises the laboring man of different color (black) here; and it despises the laboring man of the same color (white) here. In the language of Chancellor Harper, of South Carolina, “bodily labor must be disreputable, from the mere influence of association,” (slavery.) Hence it is that white laborers at the South are styled “mean whites.” In the same spirit, Robert Wickliffe, of Kentucky, called white laborers “white negroes.”

’Tis caste that excludes the free white laborers from the first table, and from the family of many slaveholders and aristocrats.

Free white laborer, remember you can never rise whilst you tolerate that slavery which *degrades your labor*, and sustain those institutions which foster *caste*.

Yea, the time may come, in our own country, in which color will be no barrier to the depredations of slavery itself; for, in the Roman empire, color marked not the boundary of slavery. It made prey of men as white, and even whiter than the masters themselves. And in our own State I have heard slaveholders, and professing Christians, too, say, “It would be just as right to enslave *white* men as black men, if the law would allow it.” All that such men want, in order to enslave the reader or writer of these articles is the *power*. In some future day give them a law and public sentiment saying, every white laborer shall be sold as a slave, then you and I, dear reader, may be slaves. Consent to nothing that degrades innocent men; for the moment you do this you give the tyrant a plea to enslave you. Men with fair skin and blue eyes are *now* sold in our country.

Reader, as you will preserve your own honor, and your own liberty, give aid to no institution that degrades man, degrades labor, and feeds caste. Slavery degrades labor and makes caste. And colonization defends, prolongs slavery and feeds caste. *It is man's enemy, as well as God's.*

It declares that its object "involves not intrusion upon property (slavery), or *even upon prejudice*"—(caste.)—(*Fifteenth Annual Report.*)

It apologizes for this prejudice, (see 47th page of same report,) by declaring that "this prejudice is an ordination of Providence, and no more to be changed than the laws of nature."

We often hear the same assertion now, in language like the following: "It is not sinful prejudice, it is only natural aversion to a black skin." We answer: we have no *natural* aversion to a black coat or a black hat. Nor has the infant child any aversion to a colored person; has not, until taught by older persons. We have no aversion to colored persons, when they are waiters in the coach or nursery. Here, in slave States, we often see colored men, as slaves, ride along by the side of their "young master" and their "young mistress," and by their old master and old mistress, and in the same carriage, and on the same seats, as slaves and waiters. And slave women sit in the family room with their mistresses, and nurse and sew for, and talk with these mistresses all day, and that too, in a manner most agreeable to their mistresses, so long as they are slaves. But if the same persons were free men and free women, and riding along with these same white persons in a state of social equality, these same white persons, and society at large, would be shocked, horrified! And why? What is the trouble? 'Tis not instinctive aversion to color, or *it would not be*

chosen in the first instance. But it is PRIDE! Such persons are afraid of being, as they suppose, *lowered*, by being on an equality with one whose color, by association, is degraded; degraded because of the condition his color has been made to assume. *'Tis condition, not color, that makes caste.*

The Egyptians would not come upon a social equality with the brethren of Joseph, because they were shepherds. It was not because the brethren of Joseph were darker complexioned than the Egyptians, (they were fairer,) but because every shepherd was, in "custom, an abomination to an Egyptian."—(Gen. xli. 34.) It was condition then, as now in India and in our own country, that made caste. Let us not feed caste, but put on more of the spirit of the gospel, and nature of Christ, and live it down. We shall not be blessed of God until we do it. The spirit of God can not dwell in a proud heart. He "gives his grace to the humble, but regards the proud afar off."

Do you say the caste is not in us, but in others. We reply, few colonizationists, so far as we know, but what have this caste themselves. But if they have not, let them employ their means, talents, and labors to break down this ungodly, soul-damning caste, and thus relieve the colored brother from his oppression, and the white brother from perdition; for, "he that hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." So says God. We have no less caste in our hearts, when we have banished the colored man four thousand miles from us, than when he was in our midst.

Also, it is a fact worthy of our consideration, that there is now more caste against the colored man than there was before the Colonization Society was organized, and more

than in other countries where no Colonization Society exists.

But, says another, "the present colonization scheme has done great good in Africa, by extending civilization there, and in assisting to break up the slave-trade." We reply :

. You "may not do evil," (by forcing the colored man away, and fostering caste,) "that good may come."

2. Where is the consistency of opposing the slave-trade in Africa, and encouraging it at home. Up to the last election, every president of the Colonization Society has been a slaveholder. "The first was careful to call his slaves together, on one occasion, and tell them, though he was a colonizationist, he did not intend to set one of them free. Soon after, fifty-four of these slaves were sent to the New Orleans market."—(*Judge Jay.*)

The second left a thousand in slavery. The third sent none to Liberia, and left one hundred to his heirs to be scattered "hither an' yon."—(*Stebbins.*)

The last, we believe, left all his slaves then born, to live and die in slavery. Those born after the year 1850, to remain in slavery twenty-five years, and then, if they can be found, and if any friend will endure odium in inquiring for a colored man's rights, they may get their liberty by consenting to be banished.

The New Orleans Courier, in 1839, declared that, although the prohibition of the foreign slave-trade "put millions into the pockets of the people living between the Roanoke and Mason and Dixon's line, it would need some casuistry to show the slave-trade from that quarter a *whit better than the African.*" A writer in the New Orleans Argus, for 1830, estimated "the loss of life by acclimation, at twenty-five per cent.

If the Colonization Society wishes really to break up the slave-trade on the African coast, why does not the

Society oppose the same execrable traffic here on our own coast? If a missionary should affect great zeal to convert sinners abroad, and at the same time had no heart nor efforts for the same work at home, we should infer, either that he intended to deceive others, or was deceiving himself.

Many persons question the honest purpose of the Liberian colony to oppose the slave-trade, inasmuch as up to 1837 and 1838, slavetraders obtained aid, boarding, and materials for the trade from the colony. "Mr. Lewis, SECRETARY OF THE COLONY, was in Blanco's employ in the slave-trade in 1837; his warehouse in Monrovia was Blanco's depot for slave-trade goods; and slavers came that year to Monrovia to get goods for the trade."—(*Admission of Mr. Pinney.—Stebbins.*)

But if we grant to the colony honest purpose to oppose the slave-trade, which is probably true, the colony has but little ability with which to do it. "Whilst it is true, important aid has been derived from these settlements, in breaking up the slave factories, ('on the Liberian coast') it is equally true that they could have rendered no such aid, had it not been for the support of English and other men-of-war on the coast, and for the simple reason that altogether they have not sufficient naval force to contend with one armed slaver."—(Letter of Rev. J. L. Wilson, American missionary, whose letter was printed and sent to Lord Palmerston.) "Almost her entire naval armament is a small schooner, given by the British government to the Republic; the land force is small."—(*G. B. Stebbins.*)

Recently the naval force of Liberia has been slightly increased by a small present from France. What can such a force accomplish in a coast of eight thousand miles?

Again to suppress the trade in Liberia, is but to divert it to another, or other places. It is like diverting the waters from a certain point on the surface of a dam ; it is but to turn them to other channels. This will continue to be so until the great *demand here*, in Cuba, and other places is stopped. From the report of Sir Thomas F. Buxton, on the slave-trade, we learn that, annually, many thousands of slaves are brought from Africa to Cuba, and from thence smuggled into the southern portions of this country. As a matter of fact, the slave-trade is now greater than it was even ten years since.

In 1840, sixty-four thousand one hundred and fourteen slaves were sent from Africa to America. In 1847, eighty-four thousand three hundred and fifty-six. 'Tis then worse than futile for the president of the Colonization Society, in his late speech, to say, "the Society will be remembered with gratitude, as the exterminator of the slave-trade." And where is the consistency, yea, the moral honesty, of that scheme, which at one time holds up the Colonization Society as the patron or friend of slavery, and at another as that which will secure the extinction of slavery ? Both can not be true.

3. We hope and pray that the slave-trade may be broken up, abroad as well as at home, and that the Colonization Society may have a share in this glorious work ; but there is a *better way* of doing it, than forcing innocent, ignorant, "degraded men," as colonizationists call them, to go to that land ; and also foster prejudice against those who are here. Had the Colonization Society lent no sanction to the banishment of men without their free choice, no support to the slave system, but a constant and consistent rebuke against it, and then had employed its means and influence to elevate the colored man here, and then had *induced voluntary colonists* to go, as George Thompson

and his co-laborers have gone, we believe still more good would have been done, without the evil now done.

But, says another, if you elevate the colored man here, then you will bring about amalgamation. We reply :

1st. A slaveholding and a slave-defending colonizationist (and we have shown that present colonization is a slave-defending and slave-perpetuating scheme,) should be the last person to talk about amalgamation. There is a hundred fold more amalgamation in a state of slavery than in a state of freedom. A glance at the state of society in the free States will prove this. Henry Clay, a few years since, said, "If slavery continues a century, all complexional difference will cease." Yet the present scheme of colonization perpetuates slavery, and therefore those who perpetuate this scheme, perpetuate amalgamation.

2d. Better that we have black faces than bad hearts, and reap eventually the torments of hell. We may have pure hearts if our faces should, after the lapse of a century or two, be a little tawny.

3d. When that period comes around in which the colored man shall be so esteemed as that amalgamation shall take place, it will cease to be regarded as a crime, as with Moses when he married the Ethiopian woman.

'Tis a poor resort, when, to defend our sins, we appeal to prejudices.

The next most popular position is, "Let us banish the whole of the colored people, slaves and all; then there will be no perpetuation of slavery, nor any amalgamation." We reply--

1. Then we shall sin against God and our fellow men, by doing as we would not be done by. For many will not go, only as they are forced. We had better not ruin our souls to gratify our prejudice.

2. We can never raise the means with which to send them off, purchase lands for them, and feed them through the seasoning. It would take from two to three hundred millions of dollars to do it. Where will we get the money? The North will not raise it. "The South can not." The present president of the Colonization Society has the following language: "Colonization is as utterly incompetent to transport the whole colored population of the United States to Africa, as it would be impossible to ladle out one of our northern lakes with a kitchen utensil." "All that Congress can give will be insufficient for the purpose; all that the States can give will be insufficient; all that individuals can give will be insufficient. * * * To what, then, is colonization competent? It is competent to building up of colonies on the coast of Africa, offering the same attraction to the colored man in this country that this country offers to the European." * * *

"When that shall be the result of our labors we shall see an emigration from America to Africa like that we now see from Europe to America." We ask,

When will it be done? If it takes the Colonization Society thirty-seven years to build up a colony sufficient to receive seven thousand six hundred, and attract less than half of those voluntarily, how long will it take the Society to build up colonies sufficiently large and enchanting to receive and attract three millions and their *increase*? It will be long after that period shall have elapsed in which Henry Clay says, "all complexional difference will have ceased." Where then will be the necessity for colonization? What foggy dreaming to gratify prejudice and perpetuate slavery.

Also, colonizationists in their theorizing, will do well, in devising plans on which the destiny of millions is designed to turn, to inquire how many emigrants new and

feeble colonies are capable of receiving? Emigrants to our western States sometimes endure great suffering on account of the scarcity of provisions, and want of employment in a newly-settled country. The president of the Colonization Society, in an address delivered last year, speaking of the condition of the colony about twenty years since, said, "This was a critical time for colonization. Had the supply of emigrants continued, they would have been shipped, and great injury would have been done. The colonies were not yet ready for the numbers that would have gone forward. To have crowded them at that time with such emigrants as would have been procured, comparatively ignorant and inexperienced, might have postponed for a long time their independence, if not periled the whole scheme."

It will probably be fifty years before the colony could receive an annual increase of fifty thousand colonists, and yet, with the increase of the colored population from 1820 to 1830, the annual increase in a few years will be not less than one hundred and fifty thousand. And what will the increase be when that fifty years roll round? and what the principal? Verily, colonization is the greatest humbug of this age, as a remedy for slavery.

Now the colony is embarrassed with debt, and scarcely able to raise revenue enough to carry on its wars with the neighboring tribes; in one of which wars, says a writer from there, "every shot spent its force in a mass of living human flesh." Moreover, we have no assurance that Liberia would *consent* to receive a sixtieth part of our colored population, if they were willing to go, and we had the means with which to send them. It is one thing to assume what can be done, but quite another to make it a practical reality.

To emancipate on the soil, we know can be done. The

same soil that *now sustains* them, can *continue to sustain* them. The thing has been done, in scores of instances, and with safety. But for one nation to send off at once, or in a short time, three millions of colonists, never has been done. They may go out with *their own choice*, under the delivering hand of the Almighty, as the Hebrews did from the Egyptian oppressors; but it is folly to talk of sending off, by forcible colonization, a nation of people near four millions strong; and to slaveholders increasing a fearful ratio. We triumphantly ask, when will it be? Surely colonization is a delusive scheme.

3d. What assurance have we that the slaveholder would let his slaves go, if we had the money necessary to colonize the slaves? Of this there is no probability.

Do you say, we will go to work and change public sentiment, and pass laws securing the emancipation of the slaves? We say, *that is the work* that has to be done, and the sooner the better; all else is mere subterfuge, an excuse to avoid present responsibility.

4th. If the slaveholder would give up his slaves, and non-slaveholders could raise two hundred millions of dollars with which to colonize the colored people, it would be not only morally wrong to force them away, but highly *inexpedient*. We should have to import two or three millions of foreigners to labor in their stead; and, although the writer, like many other citizens, by running back two or three generations, can find English and Irish ancestors, and although he is in favor of allowing every foreigner to come, who will be a law-abiding subject, that he may receive and do good, yet he hesitates not to say, that our colored population are a more virtuous, quiet, obedient, law-abiding, hopeful class of subjects than many, very many, of our foreign emigrants.

There is no portion of our citizens, Americans or for-

eigners, more quiet or law-abiding than the colored people. None would so readily receive the gospel of Christ.

Many entertain great fears from the Catholic power already in this country. Shall we banish quiet, orderly, Protestant Christians, to introduce querulous, dissipated Catholics, with sworn allegiance to a foreign Pope? And for what? To gratify the supposed worldly interest of a few, and the soul-damning prejudice of a few more. Never did a civilized people propose a scheme of more consummate folly and weakness.

In connection with the point now under consideration, let us notice another kindred one. Some who are non-slaveholders, and free laborers, say, "If all the negroes were removed, then there would be more employment for those of us, who are free white laborers."

1st. Shall any of us be so selfish as to wish our own aggrandizement or interest at the banishment, expense of the natural rights of a poor man, already too long oppressed? Is there one in our land, who, on a second reflection, would ask such a thing? Such would be selfish, ungenerous, and unmanly, to say no more.

2d. Such persons forget that if all the slaves were banished, and therefore the odium of slavery gone, then free laborers would flock in from the North, and from Europe, and there would be no more employment for our free white laborers than if the colored people were left here. Now the laborer gets but little employment from the slaveholders, and if he does get any, his labor is along with *slaves*, his labor degraded, and he degraded with it; otherwise he must stay in poor districts and get but little.

Says one, "I care not for my degradation, nor that of my labor, so I get money. I can get higher wages in slave, than in the free States." As a general rule, just the opposite of this will be found true.

Any man, by referring to the census of 1850, will see that the prices for physical labor are better in free states than in slave states. Let the South proclaim freedom to all, and immediately the capitalist would come in, establish factories, build up towns, railroads, &c. This would make an increased demand for labor.

Again; employment is precarious, uncertain, only occasional, for the slaveholder will not employ the free laborer except when necessity compels; for he wants not the free laborer with his slaves.

Also, not only are the field hands supplanted by slave labor, but the mechanic is being supplanted by slave labor. The slaveholders in many places are now teaching their slaves to be blacksmiths, tanners, brick-masons, plasterers, carpenters, &c. It is then for the interest of every non-slaveholder to go in for emancipation at once, and upon the soil. The right course is the best course. "Nothing is gained by thieving," especially in the long run; so runs the old proverb. Let us be men, and not act with the frivolity and selfishness of children. Let us be philanthropists, with generous spirits, and scorn to oppress a weak, but innocent and law-abiding race. *Let us be Christians*, and act with that magnanimous, impartial love which characterized the Prince of Glory, the Saviour of mankind, who sought to enlighten the ignorant, reclaim the vicious, relieve the oppressed, do good to all, and injure none.

Again, it would be great ingratitude on the part of this nation, to banish the colored man. In the time of its struggle for freedom, with a foreign power, the colored people, slaves and freemen in solid ranks, fought, side by side with the white man, for the liberties and immunities of this country. For proof, see the following extracts:

"At the early part of the revolutionary war, there

was found in the middle and northern States, many blacks and other people of color, capable of bearing arms, a part of them free, and a greater part of them slaves. The freemen entered our ranks with the whites. The time of those who were slaves was purchased by the State, and they were induced to enter the service in consequence of a law, by which, on condition of their serving in the ranks during the war, they were made freemen.

* * The gallant defense of Red Bank, in which the black regiment bore a part, is among the proofs of their valor.”—(Extract from a speech of Governor Eustis, of Mass., in the Congress of U. S., 1820—the Missouri question, whether colored people should be settlers or not.)

Charles Pinkney, of South Carolina, in reference to the colored people, said: “They were, during the revolution, as they still are, as valuable a part of our population to the Union, as any other equal number of inhabitants.

“They were, in numerous instances, the pioneers; and in all the labors of your armies, to their hands were owing the execution of the greatest part of the fortifications raised for the protection of our country.

“Numerous bodies of them were enrolled and fought, side by side with the whites, the battles of the revolution.”

So, also, the proclamation of General Jackson to the free people of color in Louisiana, Sept. 21, 1814. “*As Americans,** your country looks with confidence to her adopted children for valorous support. As fathers, husbands, and brothers, you are summoned to rally round the standard of the eagle, to defend all that is dear to

* General Jackson called those colored men “*Americans*,” because, though their forefathers came from Africa, yet these were *born in America*, and therefore they were Americans. *This* is their native land, and by birth and labor they have as good a right to it as the white man has.

existence"—liberty. They did rely, and fought with praise from their commanders.

See, also, the speech of Hon. Mr. Morrill, in Senate of United States, and reported in the *National Intelligencer* for Jan. 11, 1821. Speaking of the colored people, he says: "What did you say to them on their enlistment? We will give you a monthly compensation, and at the end of the war, one hundred and sixty acres of land, and on which you may settle, and by cultivating the soil, spend your declining years in peace, and in the enjoyment of those immunities for which you have fought and bled! Where is the public faith in this case?"

The war over, the colored man has quietly labored for nearly a century, felling the forest and cultivating the fields, whilst the master reclines at ease under the shade, or around the fireside; and all without scarce a murmur. And now, guilty of no crime, and merely to gratify the prejudice of a few haughty ones, he must be banished three thousand miles from the land of his birth, which he has defended by his blood, cultivated with his hands, and bedewed with his sweat and tears. If there is a thunder-bolt of the Almighty, hot with his wrath, and in reserve for guilty nations, it will be for the people who shall commit such a deed as this.

Some one, perhaps, is ready to say, "African colonization is perhaps impracticable and inexpedient, but let us take a part of our own territory, as in Texas or New Mexico, and put the colored people there." We reply—

1st. The principle of forcing away, in this case, is just as sinful, just as much a violation of the golden rule, as to banish them to Africa.

2d. With the present means of conveyance, it will cost more to send them there than to Africa. We can not raise the money.

3d. The slaveholders will be just as unwilling to give them up in this case as in the former case.

4th. The same evils will attend a foreign immigration as in the former case.

5th. Will this government, which has been so unwilling for any other government to occupy a spot within her territory, consent that a nation of people shall be placed right in her midst, and who, from the very treatment (banishment) received at the hands of this nation, must become our enemies, and be thrown at once in sympathy and alliance with other nations? Will this government consent to such a plan? It is folly to talk of such.

We then oppose all these schemes, because they are unjust, un-Christian, impolitic, and because they are delusive schemes which serve to *prolong the evil of slavery*.

We should not then go into convention and consent with a majority to do a thing which we know is morally wrong, impracticable, and serves only to perpetuate the curse of curses upon our country and fellow men. There is neither patriotism, philanthropy, nor Christianity in such.

We should consent only to Heaven's order: "Break every yoke and let the oppressed go free;" *let them choose their own homes; do as we would men should do unto us.*

What! says one, Let them go free, right here among us? We answer: What else can we do? Colonization is hopeless; and the issue is, freedom on the soil, or prolonged slavery, with all its attendant evils and dangers. Also, God, justice, and humanity demand it.

But again, as C. M. Clay has said, "are they not already among us?" And are they not in a much more dangerous condition than if they were free? If any thing can drive a numerous and hardy people to desperation, it must be the galling tyranny of slavery. And when it

shall be known that this nation has determined not to give freedom to her slaves, such intelligence will engender a mad despair, a sullen desperation, which will know no mitigation but in the blood of its oppressors. It is despair that drives to desperation. If recent reports of insurrections be true (See App. B.), such insurrections exist only because the dominant party, by its acts, declares it will perpetuate slavery at the expense of law and order—even by bloodshed.

There is, then, no *practicable and safe scheme, but emancipation on the soil*. And if the colored people are quiet and unvengeful in a state of slavery, will they not be much more so when we shall confer upon them the favor, the boon of freedom? If I do a man a favor, may I not, from what I know of human nature, reasonably expect a favor in return? And does not the history of emancipation, the world over, sustain this position? In the city of New York, a silk merchant, some years since, distinguished himself as the friend of the colored people. At the time of the great fire there, when whole squares were speedily consumed in the raging flames, colored people rushed to the house of this friend, and bore off in safety much of the silk he had, to a place of deposit; in less than three days time he was selling silk on his new counter. Such they would be to the slaveholders now, if slaveholders would be their friends.

A still more beautiful illustration is found in the history of emancipation in the West India Islands. On one of the islands, “when the hour of twelve approached, the missionary proposed that they (the slaves) should kneel down and take the boon of freedom in silence. Accordingly, as the loud bell tolled its first note, the crowded

assembly prostrated themselves on their knees. All was silent, save the quivering, half-stilled breath of the struggling spirit. The slow notes of the clock fell on the multitude, peal on peal, peal on peal rolled over the prostrated throng in tones of angel voices, thrilling among the desolate cords and weary heartstrings. Scarcely had the clock sounded its last note when the lightning flashed vividly around, and a loud peal of thunder roared along the sky; God's pillar of fire, and his triumph of Jubilee. A moment of profound silence passed, then came the burst; they broke forth in prayers, they shouted, they sang glory, hallelujah; they clapped their hands, leaped up, fell down, clasped each other in their free arms, laughed, cried, went to and fro, tossing up their unfettered hands. Above all, in broken dialect, was heard the uttering of gratitude to God," Yes, with gratitude to God. There was no danger of insurrection then.

The next day the daily papers appeared, announcing, "First day of emancipation—all is safe." So for the second, and third, and on until they became ashamed that they had even anticipated danger, and ceased to notice the order and quiet which everywhere prevailed. From that day to this they have had more quietude, peace, and sobriety, than they ever had in a state of slavery. Education, religion, arts and science now flourish more, by far, than in a state of slavery; and that, too, when there were in some of the islands ten, and even fourteen, colored persons to one white person. Such has been the history of emancipation the world over; we challenge investigation.

Does any one say, that there was rebellion in St. Domingo? We reply: yes, when the French tried to *again*

oppress and subjugate the colored people ; just as the American colonies rebelled when the English attempted to oppress them. But when the colored people have not been interrupted, no people are more unoffending. No people in the world are so proverbial for submission, kindness, and gratitude for favors bestowed. In our own country they are, without the boon of freedom, more quiet and orderly than many, very many of our white citizens, even many slaveholders and their sons.

Does any one say, “the West Indies do not export as much as they did in the days of slavery.” We reply—

1st. Often, in the days of slavery, those islands were reduced to bankruptcy and reverses in trade.

2d. The proprietors deprived themselves of operatives, through the colonial legislature, by taking from the free colored man his provision grounds, offering small wages, and placing upon his imported provisions such an unequal and heavy tariff, that he was compelled to seek a home or grounds of his own, and make his living off of it ; working thus for himself, rather than for the planter. Selfish oppression was the cause, not freedom.

3d. If they now export less than immediately before emancipation, they raise more, and a greater variety, for home consumption, and of provisions, import less.

4th. Many of the women who were once field hands, are now in their proper sphere, engaged with domestic concerns, much more useful and happy. Many of the men have now purchased little homes of their own, and are busy in improving and cultivating them. Others have become mechanics, and find employment in the villages and towns now springing up on the islands.

5th. Many are now spending part of their time in mental and moral culture, in schools and churches, instead of spending eighteen hours in the field and distillery; and if less sugar and rum are exported, there is more of physical and intellectual, and moral well being. And shall we balance intellectual and moral attainments with sugar and rum? spiritual with temporal?

Freedom is the natural state of man, and always has and will work better than slavery. Let us have it.

Here we may notice a popular objection to emancipation on the soil. It is often said, "the colored man can not rise, can not prosper on the same ground with the white man." Let us look at facts! Some twenty years since, eight hundred thousand slaves were in two years time freed on the soil, in the West Indies. In one of those islands, Jamaica, out of a population of two hundred and ninety-three thousand colored persons, some fifty-five thousand are now landholders. Give to each landholder a family of five persons, and this estimate will give to most of this people a home of their own. Some are mechanics and professional men.

About twenty thousand colored persons, and about fifteen thousand white persons, are not cultivators of the soil. These are fed by these colored persons who are landholders. Most of the coffee, ginger, and pimento exported are of their producing. They work. Out of forty representatives in the House of Assembly, twelve are colored men. One colored judge. One of the most eloquent lawyers at the bar is a colored man. The proprietors and editors of the Morning Journal, in Kingston, are colored men. The chief surgeon in the hospital at Kingston, is a colored man. Councilmen, magistrates, book-

keepers, clerks, &c., are colored men. They can rise—they have risen. About one half attend church, and about one fourth are communicants. Out of a population of three hundred and seventy-seven thousand in Jamaica, there are more communicants than in London, with a population of two and a half millions.—(*Address of Rev. T. Hands, at Exeter Hall, London.*)

Cincinnati, Ohio, has a colored population of three thousand five hundred. And of eleven hundred children, about five hundred are in schools in the city, and fifty out of the city.

“They have taxable property to the amount of eight hundred thousand dollars. This, divided among some six hundred and eighty-three families, gives more property to each, than is to be found with some of the kins-folks of the reader and writer, or the Irish in the same city. Of these colored persons, seven are boss carpenters, three boss cabinet makers, three blacksmiths, three boss plasterers, five painters, eighteen draymen, three daguerreotypists, three teachers, five preachers, and others in divers other employments.

“They have six churches, eight hundred and thirty communicants; near one fourth. Most attend church. This is more than can be said of the white population of the same city. They have improved one hundred per cent. in ten years.”

This report I receive from H. B. Blackwell, a hardware merchant on Main street, Cincinnati.

I have a personal acquaintance with three of these colored men. Thirty-two years since one of them was a slave in Kentucky. Now he is one of the first cabinet

makers in the city of Cincinnati, and is worth from forty to fifty thousand dollars.

Another, twenty-one years since, was a slave sold on the auction block in Lexington, Ky. He has now a barbershop and other property on Third street, and is worth twenty-five thousand dollars. Another was a slave seven years since, paid seventeen hundred dollars for himself, and is now a coal merchant, worth not less than twenty thousand dollars. These men are honest laborers, and the facts demonstrate that they are men of industry, perseverance, and enterprise. They are valuable citizens, and will compare well, in this respect, with the best of slaveholders.

“New York city, Williamsburg, and Brooklyn contain about sixteen thousand three hundred and thirty-three colored persons. These have a business capital of one million one hundred and sixty thousand dollars, and eight hundred and thirty-nine thousand dollars worth of property. In the last twenty years they have increased in population twenty-five per cent.; in wealth, one hundred per cent.” — (*J. McCune Smith, M. D., of New York.*)

In the city of Philadelphia and vicinity, there were, in 1847, about twenty thousand colored persons, owning about five hundred and thirty-one thousand dollars worth of property, beside money owned and invested in various ways.

Of children between the ages of five and twenty, there were four thousand five hundred. Of this number, two thousand and forty were going to school. Not half of

the white children of the southern States are going to school.

Belonging to these colored persons were nineteen churches, twelve of which had an aggregate membership of three thousand nine hundred and seventy-four, and a regular attendance of six thousand one hundred. Seven more not reported.

We here remark, we have not searched for the best examples, but have taken such as were in our possession at the time of writing this tract—1853.

Let it be borne in mind, also, that many of these colored persons were, a few years since, slaves, without the education the rising generation is receiving. But, notwithstanding the absence of education, and the small amount of capital to begin with, facts show that the colored man can rise and do well in this country.

In some of the most virtuous, prosperous, and intelligent States of this Union, the colored man has his oath, the privileges of the elective franchise, and offices of public trust. And in many of the free States, public sentiment is fast rising to that point in which his social, religious, and political privileges will be equal with that of the white man.

In the free States, where colored persons have some facilities for education, most of them are making very commendable progress.

From an article in the *Friends' Review*, with statistics taken from the census of 1850, we learn that there are, in the six New England States, more persons among the colored people, according to their population, who can read and write, than there are among the white population of Virginia or North Carolina. The proportion of colored persons in New England who cannot read and write,

is one out of seven. In Virginia, among the white population, one out of every six ; and in North Carolina, two out of every seven.

There are localities where, of course, we do not expect the colored people to make rapid progress, mentally or socially.

The incubus of slavery is yet resting upon them : ignorance, former habits, caste, all these depress them, and limit their opportunities for doing and getting good. No class of men will rise under such depressing circumstances : yet, with all their embarrassments, the colored people, slaves and freemen, are far more elevated, intellectually and morally, than our forefathers were in the time of Cæsar. His description of the Britons is as follows : “ In their domestic and social habits, the Britons are as degraded as the most savage nations. They are clothed with skins : wear the hair of their heads unshaven and long, but shave the rest of their bodies except at the top of the upper lip, and stain themselves a blue color with wood. They live in hollow trees and low huts.”

Cicero advised his friend Atticus “ not to buy slaves from Briton, on account of their *stupidity*.”—Elliott, vol. II. p. 33. How fallacious would be the argument of Cicero and Cæsar, should they arise and argue that the descendants of these Britons should be enslaved, because their forefathers were so ignorant and degraded ! Yet such is the argument offered by those who oppose the freedom of the colored man. By enslaving they keep the poor man ignorant and degraded : then they turn round and blame the man for being ignorant and degraded ; and say “ he is not fit for liberty.” If this position were true, then many thousand white, native-born citizens

should not be free. To all this we reply, in the language of a distinguished congressman, "As the best way to teach men to swim is to allow them to go into the water, so the best way to teach men how to exercise liberty is to allow them to enjoy it."

As an objection to the foregoing, it may be said, "although it is oppressive and unrighteous to banish an unoffending man from the land of his birth, yet the laws of most of the slave States forbid emancipation on the soil: disregard the conscience of the master, and the rights of the slave: we must send to Liberia or continue the sin of slavery."

We reply: such laws ought not to be obeyed: because,

1. They are impious and wicked. They trammel the conscience of the master in his duty to his God and his fellow-man.

A law that is not immoral and wicked ought to be borne with until it can be repealed. But an impious, wicked law may not be obeyed: just as the three Hebrew children refused to obey Nebuchadnezzar in commanding them to bow down to the golden image. Just as John and Silas refused to obey the Sanhedrim, when it required them to speak no more in the name of Jesus. They said, "Whether we should obey God or man, judge ye."

2. Such laws are unconstitutional. The constitution of this nation declares, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or *prohibiting the free exercise thereof*." Banishment of innocent men violates the spirit of that clause.

The constitution of Kentucky expressly declares, "All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the *dictates of their own consciences*; and that no human authority ought in any

case whatever, to control or *interfere with the rights of conscience.*"

Now, our Saviour has taught us that true religion is summed up in "Loving God with all the heart, and our neighbor as ourselves." "Doing to men as we would they should do to us." Here is a law, however, requiring us to banish innocent men from the land of their birth—to do to them as we would not men should do to us. This law violates religious duty, *interferes with the rights of conscience*, and is therefore unconstitutional, and should really have no binding effect.

If it is said, "under the existing laws, the freed man would be taken up by some men and imprisoned, and sold again into bondage," we reply,

1. Let us do our duty, if others will do wrong. Let us set a right example. That is all God requires of us.

2. Public indignation would soon rise against such inhumanity, and reaction would follow.

3. Let the freed man be apprised of his condition, and let him take the responsibility of staying or escaping to such of the free States as are yet open to him.

To Canada, also, he can go and do well. There benevolent associations have bought up thousands of acres for the benefit of colored emigrants. This land is sold out to these emigrants, in small parcels, for small sums. There the colored people can get plenty of employment with good wages. There they have schools and churches, and the mass of them are doing well, as I am personally assured by two ministers of the gospel now living there.

Right is always safe. Let us do our duty.

One more consideration which should prompt us to act justly and speedily for the relief of the colored man:

that consideration is, no nation has long prospered which persisted in oppressing their fellow men.

Let us look at the past. It is full of instruction. What is it? A sea of stranded wrecks, vessels of state, kingdoms, empires, and republics, which have been wrecked upon the rocks of oppression and injustice. Shall we rush upon the same with impunity, and expect to live? It can not be.

Let us turn to Revelation. Does it not tell us that God has ever been on the side of the oppressed, and against the oppressor? What means the Egyptian overthrow; the river converted into stagnant pools of blood; the boils and blains upon man and beast; the fire and hail that played in the pathway; the streets and highways piled up with things of loathsome form; the couches and kneading-troughs wreaking with dissolving nature; the shrieks of the firstborn sounding from every chamber; and, above all, that stretched-out arm of the Almighty that raised the waters of the Red sea like walls of stone on either side, whilst the children of Israel, the oppressed ones, went through dryshod, and the oppressors, essaying to do the same, were overthrown in the sea, and the waters rushed upon them, and buried them beneath its turbid waves in an ignominious grave? These things were written for our instruction. The same revelation tells us that we shall not vex a stranger nor oppress him; that we "shall not afflict *any* widow or fatherless child;" "*any*," (white or black.) "If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will hear their cry, and my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall be widows and your children shall be fatherless." Already the nations are taking up their line of march, and preparing for the battle.

In our own country an observation of facts tells us that the center of the free white population is steadily moving toward the northwest, whilst the center of the colored population is steadily moving toward the southwest, at the rate of three hundred and fifty miles every sixty years, and setting around the Gulf of Mexico. That in close proximity to these four millions, are seven millions more colored persons in Mexico, South America, and the West India islands. All these sympathize with the four millions of oppressed ones here. It is estimated that these slaves, by natural increase, double themselves in twenty years; this number in twenty more; and that in twenty more. Within a single lifetime we shall have thirty millions of stout, athletic slaves, with the increasing strength of their neighboring allies, whilst the slaveholders will be raising a sparse progeny of diseased sons and feeble daughters, the fruits of slaveholding; and at the same time, the East, North, and West are fast becoming alienated from the slaveholder; and when the struggle comes, a large body of the non-slaveholders of the South will not peril their lives to perpetuate a curse upon them and their children. Where, then, will the slaveholder be?

Like Nineveh we may repent at the warning of the Almighty, and *avert the impending danger*; but if we do not repent, an awful catastrophe awaits the American people. We who are non-slaveholders should be up and doing, or we shall suffer in the common overthrow.

Act we must, some way.

We can not colonize; 'tis worse than fruitless to attempt it. We can not hold the slaves long in bondage; they will emancipate themselves, and that in a most terrific and disastrous manner to the master and his allies.

Let us obey the voice of God, "Break every yoke and

let the oppressed go free." Then the slaves will be our friends, the world will be our friend, God will be our friend.

Also, the Spirit of God, which is now grieved away from our churches by our spirit of *caste and oppression*, will return. The shekinah will dwell between the cherubims, the fire upon the altar will be lit up, and the glory of the Lord will be upon Zion. Then shall she come forth "fair as the sun, clear as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners."

APPENDIX.

A.

The statistics in this tract were collected in 1853; and the first edition being stereotyped, they remain as first written.

B.

Recent facts show that most of the reports of insurrections are false; the whole of them very questionable. Political purposes and guilty fears are enough to account for most, if not all.

And if agitation really awakened insurrections, that is no reason why we should desist from a good work, any more than the plagues and commotions in Egypt were a reason why Moses should cease to demand of Pharaoh, "Let the people go."

The Depository of the AMERICAN REFORM TRACT AND BOOK SOCIETY is kept at 180 Walnut street, Cincinnati.

One dollar will pay for fifteen hundred pages of tracts at the Depository, or twelve hundred pages post-paid, sent by mail, to any part of the United States.

All letters on the business of the Society, and all remittances for tracts, or as donations, should be made to T. B. MASON, Cincinnati, Ohio.

AMERICAN REFORM TRACT AND BOOK SOCIETY, CINCINNATI, OHIO.